UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese } ***Associate Editors***

City Religion

By JESSE H. HOLMES

Comments from Geneva

By SYDNEY STRONG

Why the Conference Failed

By REGINALD REYNOLDS

How Rochester Met the Unemployment Situation

By CHARLES E. BRADFORD

VOLUME CIX NUMBER 1

Chicago, March 7, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago. Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MRS. EDNA R. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 3
City Religion—JESSE H. HOLMES 5
Jottings—J. H. H. 9

ARTICLES—
A Letter from Romain Rolland on India 3
Comments from Geneva—SYDNEY STRONG 9
Why the Conference Failed—REGINALD REYNOLDS 11

POETRY—
Miner Tragedy—MELVILLE KRESS 12
I Help to Mount a Butterfly—BERTHA WILLIAMS 12
Song of a Derelict—FLORA WHITE 12

THE STUDY TABLE—
The Church in the Social Order—NATHAN ESSELL 13
Note—"India in Bondage" 14

CORRESPONDENCE—
Citizen No. 1, or Jesus as He Was—EDWARD HOLTON JAMES 14
War Debts, America, France and the Versailles Treaty—LYDIA G. WENTWORTH 15

THE FIELD—
How Rochester (New York) Met the Unemployment Situation—CHARLES E. BRADFORD 2

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

How Rochester (New York) Met the Unemployment Situation

(Charles E. Bradford)

During the past two years many "good thoughts" have been advanced for giving employment to the many of our citizens who found themselves unable to get work. Suggestions that we buy freely, make repairs and in other ways unite to fight to give more employment were brought forward from many sources.

It remained, however, for a Rochesterian to conceive and carry out a plan that crystalized these many good thoughts into action and to put the plan in such concrete form that it enabled this city to put the results of these good thoughts in actual dollars and cents spent to relieve the unemployment situation right on an adding machine tape.

Mr. Libanus M. Todd, who conceived this plan, tells of the experience he had prior to its conception in these words:

"I was importuned by many somewhat in this order. Could I not use my influence to get a worthy young man a job in one of our industries in Rochester. My reply always was that our industries could not put men to work when they had no work to do, and when they did have need of help they would doubtless feel it their duty to call back employes who had been laid off.

So I wondered what could be done to create employment when there was no work. And it seemed to me that it must resolve itself down to what we call the individual. If we could get him to spend some money it would give employment. It seemed to me that we could not just make it a general broadcast idea, but that we must have something definite, and so I wrote out a "pledge", which read as follows:

"Believing that a dollar invested in employing labor does more good than a dollar given as charity, and desiring to help to increase employment, I hereby pledge that I will, during the next three months, (or before 1932) expend at least $..... in improving my home, factory, store, buildings or grounds by purchasing desirable equipment or by making needed additions, repairs or alterations; and, or by making purchases for myself, family or friends, which otherwise might be deferred."

After I had this typewritten it looked fairly good to me, and I called on some of my friends and asked them what they thought of it—telling them that I had in mind making a thorough canvass of the City of Rochester to determine what we could accomplish by asking our citizens to sign such a pledge. They all gave me encouragement. The first man to whom I explained it, said: "My house needs painting. I didn't intend to have it done now, simply because I have not felt inclined to spend money, but," he

(*Continued on page* 15)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CIX MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1932 Number 1

A LETTER FROM ROMAIN ROLLAND ON INDIA

The great fight that is being now waged in India, will be very serious. It is obvious that the Government had been preparing for it for months, and doubtless has provoked the rupture. The Government will employ every means to divide India, and also to win over to its watered-down constitutional reforms the small people amongst the employees and commercial classes, and during this time the Government will strive to crush without any scruples or any regard to humaneness, the resistance of the people, and of all independent conscience.

It is difficult to get any news. The European press accepts without verification the scanty and biased news that the British censorship lets out. We must have our correspondence out yonder with people upon whom we can rely. Up to now I have been able to receive the well-informed reports that Mahadeo Desai—and those acting for him in his absence, have been able to send me, and I shall publish in the review "Europe" of Paris, appearing on the 15th. February, an article which with the aid of these documents, recapitulates the series of happenings since the disembarkation of Gandhi at Bombay up to the 8th. January.

But, what are they doing in England, such men of world fame and great speakers like Wells and Bernard Shaw? Have they no voice for what takes place outside the Empire? How sadly we miss at the present time the voice of E. D. Morel!

From the universal point of view, I regard the actual crisis as going much beyond the question of political conflict between the British Empire and India. In the eyes of millions of men, who at the present time regard as intolerable the continuance of society as now organized, and who have resolved to change it, the grandiose experiment of Gandhi's Satyagraha in India, is the *sole chance* now existing in the world, of effecting this transformation of humanity without having resort to violence. If this attempt fails, and it is followed by violence on the part of the British Empire, and the incapacity of India to resist it, there will remain no other issue in human history but violence, and it will be the British Empire itself who will have willed it. It will be a case of either Gandhi or Lenin!

In any case social justice must be accomplished. This renders still more tragic the spectacle of India, and this is why all those who have at heart social harmony, and the spirit of peace of the gospel, should help India with all their strength. .For if Satyagraha in India succumbs in the battle, it would be Christ himself who will be struck with the supreme lance thrust on the Cross, and this time there would be no resurrection.

Must it be the act of a non-Christian, must it be left to a non-Christian, to recall this fact to Christianity?

—*Romain Rolland*

India Bulletin (London)

Commander Kenworthy, English naval officer, pacifist, Laborite, now on a visit to this country, declares that Japan has started upon an invasion of Asia which will not end until the entire continent has been conquered. He says that Manchuria, now wholly severed from China, is the first step in this far-flung campaign for the seizure of a world. The second step, he goes on to say, is stumbling a bit at Shanghai, but will go on until the valley of Yangtze has been taken over. Then, thirdly, will come Canton and the south. Lastly, as a completion of the conquest, Indo-China and India will be snatched, and made the crowning glory of the vast new empire of Japan. In view of the events of the last three months, this speculation seems not improbable. Asiatic hordes have over-run the world ere this. And if Nippon is dreaming another dream of Genghis Kahn, now is the time to fulfil it, for the West is prostrate and thus can lift no finger in protest or resistance. But, somehow or other, this idea of Kenworthy does not fit into the picture of the age in which we live; and there are certain neglected factors which seem to us important. Russia, first and foremost! The Commander suggests that Japan is at this moment acting with the connivance, if not the actual support, not only of France but of the Soviets. A statement of such ignorance as this fills us with amazement. For Russia has her own designs on Asia, and sees Japan clearly enough as her one great rival. The Bolsheviks will not fight now—the Five-Year Plan is too important to be interfered with! But the idea that Russia will join hands with Japan in her Asiatic designs, or even remain indefinitely inactive, is too ridiculous for words. Then we think that an India which can handle Britain will not be utterly helpless in facing the Mikado. No—this idea of Kenworthy's is largely fantasy. Japan's purposes, we are certain, do not extend beyond certain areas of China. But this is bad enough!

It would be a tremendously interesting situation in Ireland if De Valera really got control of the Dail as a result of the recent election. Interesting not merely for Ireland, but for Britain and the world! For De Valera and his followers are thoroughgoing revolutionists who have always been opposed to the settlement which set up the Irish Free State as a dominion of the Empire, and who have always laid down, as their central item of policy, withdrawal from the Empire and establishment of Ireland as an independent nation. Now what would happen if the republicans captured the

Dail by a decisive majority, and straightway seceded from the Empire? We cannot for the life of us see how Britain could do anything but let Erin go, with such blessing (or curse!) as she could spare. For was not the old Empire duly superceded by the British Commonwealth of Nations by the recent act of Parliament? And was it not definitely known that the Commonwealth, as distinguished from the Empire, meant freedom for the separate "nations" either to stay or to withdraw? And even if England were not ready to grant this in the case of Ireland, is it conceivable that England has the money, or could find the men, to wage an interminable war across St. George's Channel? No! if, or when, De Valéra wins, we expect to see the Irish Free State set up for itself, and England make the best of it. But what is this going to mean for the rest of the Empire—South Africa, for example, where a formidable secession movement is well under way? And what especially is it going to mean for India? Is it not inevitable that the Indians should see in De Valera's victory the triumph of their own cause, and thus be spurred on to fresh effort? We have always said that India's strength in the present struggle lies in England's weakness. All India has to do is to hang on, bide her time, and the disintegration of the British Empire as a political and economic unit will release her. Thus did the stars in their courses fight against Sisera!

A young man, twenty years of age, was electrocuted in New York the other day. He had killed a policeman. The New York *Times,* describing the boy on the morning following his death at the hands of the state, spoke of him as "undersized, underchinned, underwitted."

> He never could learn to read and write in any but the crudest fashion, and he never developed beyond the mental age of ten and a half.

Other details of his life include the following: he was the illegitimate son of a policeman; when he was a month old, he was passed over to a "baby-farm," to be reared; he twice suffered injury from serious falls, and in one of his early arrests as a juvenile offender he was terribly beaten up by the police. His defense attorney at his trial plead with the court for leniency on the ground that he was "a moral imbecile." And it was this boy that the state burned to death in the electric chair! Where is there any justice in capital punishment as thus inflicted? Granted that such punishment is right and proper in innumerable cases—which we do *not!* How can it be justified in an instance of this kind? This young criminal was badly born, carelessly reared, and brutally mistreated. He had no adult mental capacity, and thus to the end was only a half-developed child. No element of moral responsibility entered into his nature at any time. He was as helpless, and as blameless, as a naughty infant. Yet the state solemnly tried him, and cruelly killed him, as though eager to get rid of the living witness of its own failure and depravity. What we have here is new demonstration of the fact that capital punishment is vengeance—the blind, stupid, fevered attempt to wreak upon another the penalty for one's own offense. It is of course a relic of barbarism. It has no place in any civilized society where sanity and mercy are supposed to rule. Just to see an electric chair, and realize the amount of cold-blooded ingenuity that went into its contriving, is to learn anew the sheer savagery of man. Alas, how long a way we have to go ere "man's inhumanity to man" is at an end.

Dr. W. E. Orchard, of the King's Weigh House Church, in London, has announced his retirement from a pulpit which he made famous around the world. What attracted attention and fame to this extraordinarily brilliant man was the almost unheard of combination which he represented of extreme radicalism and extreme ecclesiasticism. On the one side, he was an absolute pacifist, as he proved with magnificent courage during the War, an ardent social democrat, and an ardent prophet of righteousness and truth. On the other side, though denominationally a Congregationalist, he was a thorough-going ritualist and mystic, and insisted upon regarding himself and being regarded by the public, as a Catholic. It has been obvious for years that a mind as clear-cut as a diamond in the field of morals became hopelessly confused the moment it entered the field of theology. There was something pathetic about Dr. Orchard's narrow arrogances in the matter of church doctrines and practises, as there was everything superb in his far-flung sympathies with all humanitarian impulses and ideals. Here was one more case of that peculiar religious phenomenon—the double-compartment mind. For a time the very uniqueness of Dr. Orchard's position excited interest and stirred loyalty. Young men and women flocked about him, feeling in some curious way that this preacher had found a spiritual secret which they feign would share. But fundamental cleavages of the inner life, like this in Dr. Orchard's case, inevitably in the end excite distrust. If a man cannot reconcile the forces of his own nature, how can he reconcile the forces of the world? It was the old experience all over again of falling betwixt two stools. We wish, in cases of this sort, that it were possible to perform a spiritual autopsy, as surgeons perform physical autopsies, and find out what's the matter. Meanwhile, we reverence Dr. Orchard for his great services, of which his prophetic pacifist valor during the War must ever remain the chief. Let our readers turn to "The Outlook for Religion," published in 1917, and see what manner of man this was!

Jane Addams, Lillian Wald, and Florence Kelley constituted a trinity of great women who, for a generation, glorified the field of social service and reform—and now Mrs. Kelley is dead! Like her two distin-

guished associates and beloved friends, Florence Kelley was more than an idealist and advocate of change. She was in the truest sense of the word a statesman who conceived and offered practicable programs for the correcting of the evils which stirred her wrath. As the central influence of her life was her love of children and her sense of identity with women. These impulses brought her early into the field of industry, to fight child labor, low wages and long hours for women, unwholesome labor conditions, and other abominations which made American business in the old days a thing of horror. As an effective instrumentality for accomplishing her work, Mrs. Kelley early established the Consumers League, of which she remained the directing genius to the end of her days. But a woman of Mrs. Kelley's masterful character and broad sympathies could not confine her activities or restrict her leadership to any one field. Thus, in later years, she became a crusader for radical politics. All her life she battled for the freedom and equality of the Negro. In the great days of woman suffrage agitation she was in the front lines of struggle and combat. Her dominant characteristic was a rare combination of tenderness and strength. Every softer and more gracious quality of womanhood was hers, but in her work against the forces of social evil she had a courage which was illimitable. No fear could daunt her, no considerations of prudence bend her will. Opposition stirred her spirit, abuse and vilification only aroused her to greater effort. Her labors were unending—day and night, year in and year out, she plodded on her way of duty, scornful of rest, indifferent to reward or fame. As time went on, she became pathetically toil-worn—her face and figure bore all the scars of a lifetime of battle for the weak, the down-trodden, and oppressed. And now this modern saint has found her rest!

City Religion

A noteworthy fact of our western civilization is that all life is more and more essentially "city life." This change beginning a century or more ago, and showing tremendous acceleration with the passing years, has transformed America from a land of farmers to a land of city dwellers. Those who founded our republic were close to the soil; nine-tenths of the population were producers, and the cities, of a few thousands only, dealt for the most part in the immediate products of agriculture—cotton, wheat, tobacco. These conditions persisted for generations, substantially unchanged. Within the memory of the writer over two-thirds of our population were still rural, and in these figures many were counted as urban who lived in small cities depending almost wholly on the farming country about them for their business. A large proportion of these, too, were born on the farm and had the rural background in all their thinking and feeling.

Most of the households even in the smaller cities were at least semi-independent, in the sense that they raised their own vegetables and fruits and made much of their own clothing. The writer was born and raised in a small town in the Mississippi valley. The head of the family was a country doctor, with a range of practice reaching perhaps 25 miles about. Several acres surrounded the big frame house. Not only fruit and vegetables were produced and preserved for winter, but most of our meat supply was running about the place on four legs or two during the summer season, and was to be found in the smoke house or the cellar after frost came. There were plenty of domestic animals about: our milk cows, our pork pigs, chickens, ducks and pigeons, dogs and cats. We not only made all our clothing, but when it was old we tore it into strips, and after long winter evenings at sewing "carpet rags" it appeared again on our floors.

The life of that near yet remote time was not only isolated and independent, it was also primitive. I suppose it is not too much to say if one asserts that the last two centuries have seen more changes in the life of the occident than five thousand years preceding; and if one considers only our frontier regions the 200 years could be reduced to 100 or less. Even in the memory of the writer nearly all the local travel was by horse and wheeled vehicle, as it was in the time of Caesar or Hammurabi. There was one railroad near us, but it was useful only in two directions and the "horse and buggy" or the horse alone did the rest. The roads were wholly unpaved and were often impassable in rainy weather. Travelers frequently mired down and had to be hauled out by farmers. There was little machinery in farm or town and steam power was just getting into its stride. We drove horses round and round to work the primitive threshing machines. We still used the scythe, though mowing machines were appearing and were followed rapidly by reapers and by harvesters of increasing power and capacity. We made our own soap, we washed our clothing by hand, we carried water from the outdoor pump in buckets, we burned or buried our ashes and garbage, we chopped our own wood for heating our houses; we built and replaced, we cleaned and painted, we had bucket lines at fires, we had no street lights but carried lanterns, there were no police, no public nurses, no social workers. Millions of us lived in this fashion much less than a century ago. And another century backward would take us past the time of railroads and telegraphs to a time when electricity was a toy and steam but a lusty infant.

Meantime the home has progressively ceased to

be a place of industry, has ceased to be a family partnership, has largely ceased to be even a social unit. Our plots of ground grow small and disappear. The factory takes over one after another of the tasks of the household. Our houses shrink and shrink as we have less and less to do in them. The kitchen shrinks to a closet, as our food comes in ready for the table or as we go out for it. A thermostat regulates heat and an electric refrigerator regulates the cold. Our clothing is made in mass production and our task is merely to locate our sizes and shapes. Our light, our power, our music and lectures came in over wires and are turned on and off by buttons. We pull a lever to vote, we tread a pedal for our piano, we press a button to go up and down stairs, we throw a clutch to go to business, we ring a bell to talk across the world. All this is increasingly true of farm as well as of city so that all our folk become more and more essentially city folk whose life centers more and more in voting machines, in directing the power of coal, oil, gas, falling water and flowing wind, into pre-arranged channels to accomplish pre-arranged tasks. All this, therefore, means progressively less and less necessary labor, more and more leisure. Even those who still work long hours find more and more that their service is to "stand and wait" while machinery does the work. So our time with the traditions and customs of the earlier period is plunged into conditions so different as to be in large measure another world. And as a result many of our institutions have come to be misfits—wholly unsuited to our conditions. Among these is religion.

Religion came to the colonies in various forms—to New England in the harsh, narrow form of Puritanism, purified and strengthened by persecution and the hardships of exile. In the middle colonies there was more toleration, William Penn and the Quakers softening the bigotry of the narrow dogmatic sects which filled up the interspaces and spread out over the west. Maryland was mainly Catholic and Virginia brought over the Church of England with a general half-feudal manner of life much like that of the home country. But it was New England and the New England theology together with the very similar theology of the small farmer and pioneer of the middle and southern districts which gave the ethical and religious flavor to the Mississippi valley and on the whole to America. The life of the general run of America was incredibly poor and barren. Men and women worked to the limit and there was no leisure for reading, meditation and culture. Naturally, these things came to be looked upon with contempt, and industry leading to success was the great virtue. The thinker was an idler. The conditions of the unconquered west called for initiative and action. Climate, the wildness, the threatening Indians demanded fighters, not scholars, not saints. Each man tended to be a law unto himself and a certain contempt for law and order has become an evil heritage of our later generations. Slavery came to be profitable in the south and was almost universally accepted. Morality shrunk to a comparatively narrow code of sex and formal honesty, while acquisitiveness—success—wealth was the great virtue.

Under these conditions religion had little to do with the normal conduct of life. The dull monotony of routine living left men and women starved for emotion, and the great evangelistic movement of the first half of the 19th century was the response to the call of this hunger. Revivalism was an emotional orgy. Men traveled even hundreds of miles by the tens of thousands to experience the frenzied debauches of feeling aroused by livid pictures of hell and sentimental appeals promising salvation. A recent historian mentions such a revival in Kentucky attended by twenty-five to thirty thousand, among whom at times "all intellectual control had been released, some falling insensible, some writhing in fits, some crawling and barking like dogs, some having the jerks," while others surrendered themselves to sensual license. Learning was so despised that it was rather a handicap than otherwise to the minister, so that religion in general for most of the 19th century was separated from and hostile to the slowly developing sciences and the intellectual life. It is true that opposing tendencies also appeared. Congregationalism, Unitarianism and various other movements under the leadership of Channing, Emerson, and a growing group of intellectuals had their influence, but it was relatively small for a long time. So that the prevailing religion of America during its agricultural century was a narrow and bigoted "orthodoxy," centering about emotional crises and hostile to the intellectual life and development. It was generally accepted that science was opposed to religion, that scientists were probably "infidels," that college education was not unlikely to lead to the loss of souls. God was a personal imperial being, to be blindly obeyed. Worship consisted largely of emotional appeals—to men to obey this deity and win salvation—to God to be merciful and save. There was a large element of mere flattery and of groveling before him. The preaching was intellectually barren, the music poor, the churches ugly.

There is no opportunity here to trace the gradual change by which this emotional superstition lost its hold; it is still to be found in the more backward regions. Traces of it remain in the relatively feeble "Billy Sunday" campaigns; but progressively with the growth of education and the enriching of life it has lost its hold so that at its worst it is little more than a curiosity as with the "Holy Rollers" and the like, and at its best it moves on to dealing with the actual failures and evils of our times and the attempt to better them, and to beauty and truth as well.

With the drawing of people together and the increase of wealth, we have had the enormous growth of colleges and universities. The minister has lost leader-

ship to the teacher and the old time church tends more and more to become the institutional church. Even this change has not held our men and women; church attendance and interest lessens year by year. One has only to listen to the general run of radio sermons and read those published to realize why the city man—who is more and more to be every man—cares little for church religion, and is making one of his own. Here and there it finds leadership and makes centers, sometimes in churches, but more generally it is personal and not much talked about, except in moments of especial intimacy.

Before attempting to describe it we must note the gradual change which has taken place in the meaning of "religion." A generation ago it was defined as "a worship of a higher power, from a sense of need." A very recent book calls it "enthusiasm for the good," and perhaps no better illustration of the change could be given. A generation ago it was "worship"—same kind of deference to same kind of an imperial deity, varying all the way from a frightened grovel to a noble gratitude, but centering in any case about a powerful and inexplicable being from whom favors might be expected. This is still vaguely present in many minds, but it is gradually being replaced by "enthusiasm"—an inner drive leading to desired ends. The idea is an uncertain and flickering one: "a power not ourselves that makes for righteousness," the "inner light," "awareness of the realm of unattained possibilities," "the faith —in something in nature that is making for the values we cherish."

These changes are fundamental and the fact that they are taking place in the minds of men with leisure, nearness, and increasing control of nature, explains the inadequacies of the formulas and rituals which have been brought over from the Middle Age world and are retained in our churches.

As we are emancipated from the stiff static world, a mere preliminary to an after life, pictured by formal religion, we turn to the real flexible and adjustable, and plastic world in which we actually live. We contrast the inertia which does so easily possess us with the creative life of energy and vigor which now and then takes hold of an aspect of life and makes it over into new beauty; and realizing the shortness of life we long to use our powers so that they will count permanently in the making of "a new heaven and a new earth." Here is the crucial problem of progressive religion—to rescue us from the careless and thoughtless life of mere vegetation, and set our feet on the path of creation. What motives shall it set before us which will put in control our heredity from above, rather than our heredity from the clod? For here is our problem: our mysterious life is a battle ground of two differing, yet similar tendencies. We long for rest, for comfort, for happiness in passivity; we long also for happiness, for content in conflict, in struggle, in overcoming. Religion grown old centers on the passive peace of a stupid heaven, religion reborn must center on the demand of our deepest nature for creative life. Latest born of the long train of changes in organic life, almost confined to man, predominant only in a few of the highest and most energetic men, is the demand that instead of adjusting ourselves to an environment, we shall make over the world for ourselves. The century of our shift from isolated country folk to city dwellers fused together in a common life has forced that common life into the forefront and has shown us possibilities in it that make the dull and lifeless heavens of Dante's "Paradise" or Milton's "Paradise Regained," pale into insignificance. We have found that we can make the world over after our hearts' desire. Designed as we are to fit in, in a general way, to the world as we find it, we can even in a single century, so make over that world that it becomes a very different affair and makes possible a very different life. So the old life problem of the adjustment of the organism becomes the problem of a mutual adjustment for new and greater life values.

With this statement of background and conditions we now ask "What is, and what shall be the religion of the city man?"—understanding religion to be enthusiasm for the good of life, the active outreach for the values of life, and understanding values to be truth, beauty, love, happiness for all in some degree of justice and equality.

First then he will substitute for the personal god of his ancestors an impersonal element which uplifts and ennobles life by merging its interests and its hopes with that of other men. The personal god is the god of the hunter and the farmer, of the isolated unit. He must fight the hostile forces of nature, and must ally himself with the friendly faces of nature. These he therefore personifies and so creates for himself gods to placate and devils to defy. But the city man deals not with the raw forces of nature. These he has seen weighed, measured, harmonized and controlled—depersonalized. His dealings are mainly with other men, and he comes to look for hostility or good will, for competition or cooperation, for the friendly relations of organized society, or for the anarchy of the criminal. He must therefore appeal to the good in man and defend himself against the evil in man; and as he looks back to the evolution of Society, and about him to its variant forms he cannot but feel that the personal conflict within the heart and soul of each individual is merely a miniature element of a world struggle of cosmic forces in which there emerges direction and purpose on the one hand, and on the other unmeaning chaos. I say he cannot but feel this; I must modify it by recognizing that certain temperaments fail to see in the world process anything more than the interplay of atoms and energy. But even here the upward striving element in many lifts them above mere consistency to a mechanistic materialism and sets them alight with

sympathy, leading into service to that noble humanity which is the aim of religion. Men may call this atheism; but atheism is just a word, and before it gets much meaning there must be a clear idea as to what "theos" one is "a" from. Perhaps there is a more genuine "atheism" in the formal "worship" of a fictitious king-god than in the lives of many at whom the epithet is hurled. I know many who hesitate to use the word "God" because it carries so many false implications and prefer as did our Quaker forefathers to find other phrases which more truly carry their meanings. After all, it is *meanings,* not mere words, that are important.

But if the conception of God is thus fundamentally changed what of worship? Certainly that also must be changed into consistency with a religion which is essentially deeply founded on loyalty to ideals. There is no room for the begging or flattering type of prayer, or indeed for any service patterned after the ways of placating and teasing an imperial deity. That form of prayer was suggested by Jesus in the parable of the unfortunate widow whose demands were granted because she made a nuisance of herself; and much modern prayer is seemingly of that type. But the religion of nobler life, as against the religion of safer death cannot pray in this fashion. Can he pray at all? Once more we are dealing with a problem of words. Certainly a deep need of one dedicating himself to world conquest for man, is frequent periods of self-examination and renewal. A great fact, which illuminates our human life, is our capacity for living forward by the vision of what ought to be, rather than backward by custom of what has been. To seek this vision without which "the people perish" should be, and I believe is, the essential substitute for the begging-prayer. This is no more and no less than "Prayer is the heart's sincere desire, uttered or unexpressed." The old-fashioned sermon has become meaningless and platitudinous. Listen to a dozen radio sermons, excluding those from a few great preachers whose words are always worthwhile; read a dozen of those typical samples published in our daily papers. I remember descriptions of heaven and the angels, sentimental platitudes about Jesus, medieval explanations of sin and salvation and only once in a long time a sincere and genuine human utterance. It is a fact that only a few first rate or even second rate men go into the ministry these days, lacking courage to break away into the life of the world. The religion of the present day man substitutes earnest conversations dealing with realities for the formal sermons. He seeks out those who have a message for him, whether on the platform or on the golf links and in the give and take of free and fearless talk he seeks and bears witness to the truth. Other elements of the old life of religion—emotion, beauty—music and stately ritual, he takes where he can get them, or alas! in many cases, does without.

It is easy to see that the religion of the city man lacks clarity and lacks order. It is in a period of transition and many there be that lose it altogether in their resentment of the dull meaningless matter so generally thrust upon them. With a great proportion of those who hold fast to religion in its essence, it is a private possession, near and dear, and not to be much talked of. It is not unusual that its possessor would not call it by the name of religion and would indeed resent the name. But it is nevertheless the firm foundation of honorable and serviceable lives.

One final element of modern religion must not be overlooked—its relation to science. Our educational system is steeped in the scientific spirit; our newspapers and magazines take it for granted; our conversation assumes it. No religion which ignores it and opposes it has any chance whatever of any considerable influence in the modern mind. The absurd and ignorant attack of a part of the Christian Church on the theory of evolution discredited the whole institution in the minds of very many. It is rightly classed with the attack of the church on Galileo when new discoveries in astronomy unsettled the earth—and with it man—as the center of the physical universe. The scientific world is the only proper authority in matters of fact and the organization of fact into orderly science. The representatives of religion have no training and no fitness for this service and only make themselves ridiculous when they undertake it. Theirs is the greater function of accepting the world as it is, as a present fact and of keeping everlastingly before us the vision of the world as it may be and should be. So should science and religion be close partners and allies and so must the religion of the future ally itself with science if it is to accomplish any good ends.

The religion of the world-city then must recognize that much of what has been called religion is mere chaff of myth and tradition, of fear and superstition. The harvested wheat is in the fact of human capacity, under a leadership found within the marvel and mystery of our human nature, to conquer the world of matter and to adjust it to our vision of the possible future. This central core is historic fact, to be constantly rediscovered in experience. Worship is to be the ever renewed effort to let this creative element of life dominate the temporary and passing desires, which constantly tend to make life petty and unmeaning. And the life of religion is life dedicated to the bringing of all mankind together into a noble partnership for the making of the world that ought to be.

JESSE H. HOLMES.

Jottings

Why peace is a ghastly joke:

BIG JAPANESE DRIVE IS EXPECTED TODAY **LEAGUE HOLDS JAPAN TO COVENANT VOWS**

New York *Times* (February 17).

Dr. Richard C. Cabot, of the Harvard Medical School, declares that alcohol has no place whatever in medicine, "although certain medical people are paid to say otherwise, or say so for sentimental reasons." "Alcohol," he continued, as reported in the New York *Times*, "has no stimulant value. It is a narcotic, and 'wet' doctors who say it has a stimulant value are defending narcotics."

Charles M. Schwab says that Bethlehem Steel is "the very soul" of his life. We always thought so!

The arrest in India of Madeleine Slade (Mirabai) places behind the bars of English jails the last member of the party which went to England last September. The Mahatma himself, his son, Devidas, his two secretaries, Mr. Desai and Mr. Pyerilal, and now Miss Slade, are all prisoners. Add to these Mrs. Gandhi. And still the revolution goes on unabated!

An interesting paragraph from the Manchester *Guardian Weekly* (January 15, 1932):

> Mr. Lloyd George said it was a good-looking cat but a complete stranger at Churt. It forced its way into the house on several days and was duly driven out. Always it returned. And then Mr. Gandhi came.
>
> "He sat just where you are now," observed Mr. Lloyd George, pointing, "and then, if you will believe me, that cat came in through the window (pointing again), leaped on Mr. Gandhi's knee, curled up in his lap, and remained there until Mr. Gandhi rose to go. Mr. Gandhi left. So did the cat. We have never seen it since. Extraordinary, don't you think?"
>
> Mr. Lloyd George would no doubt have gone deeper into what he seemed to regard as the occult side of this episode if several photographers had not turned up from London begging that he should allow them to "shoot" him.

DEFINITIONS. (3) *Peace Conference.* A meeting of diplomats and military experts to define the conditions and prepare the causes of the next war.

J. H. H.

Comments from Geneva

[From our Special Correspondent]

Making History. I have had a close-up view of the Council of the League of Nations, now for several days, as it has been in operation. The members sit on a raised platform, 15 to 20 inches high, near the center of a room, 150 by 100 feet. It is practically a glass house, and splendidly lighted. The representatives of nearly a score of nations sit in a semi-circle. They can easily converse with each other, without rising. The "Big Five" nations sit in the middle of the circle, with France (chairman) central and Britain and Japan to the left of the chairman—Italy and Germany being on the right of the chair. The "Big Five" have permanent seats, with the others changing, China, sitting at the end just having come into membership on the Council. Rather suggestively, in view of the Manchurian development, the delegate from Nicaragua sits next to the delegate from China. Facing the Council, there is room for 200 pressmen to sit. The representatives, all but two, speak in French, every word being translated into English, and it is well done. Of course, there is a translator into French, for the English speeches.

Besides several matters, immigration, territorial boundaries, air-transport, etc., there were two important things before the Council, that promise to make history, namely, the Independence of Iraq, and the Japan-China conflict.

Iraq. During the discussion of an hour, my blood ran cold and boiled alternately. At high noon of January 28th the chairman of the Council announced its agreement to the "Emancipation of Iraq"—which thus began its birth in independence! It had been under a British mandate. And, now under the blessing of Britain, Iraq was ready to have a place in the sun, and a seat in the League of Nations! Lest all of my readers may not recognize "Iraq" let it be said it was once known as Mesopotamia. Abraham once came out of its deserts and rivers. The famous city of Bagdad is within its borders. That is the city of which we heard when the Germans were plotting to run a road from "Berlin to Bagdad!" The plan failed, and now Britain can fly her planes from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf, a distance of nearly a thousand miles, and it will be over practically British territory! For the independence of Iraq has several strong British ropes to it, which are classified as financial, judicial, military and economic. It was very interesting historically, for this is the first of the mandated territories to become "independent!" Iraq will be independent as long as she doesn't do anything important or contrary to British will. And she will have a seat in the Assembly!

France voted for Iraq "emancipation," for there is no knowing when some French mandated territory will be seeking similar emancipation. Italy gladly did ditto. The mandate-way is only another word for imperial appropriation. Why not say it? Why not say that Britain is not chiefly concerned in the emancipation of the Iraqi, but in possessing the great oil preserves, in the air-lanes to India, and a lot of other riches of conquest. The Japanese representative, Mr. Sato, sits just next to the British representative. I thought that he wore a satisfied smile when Robert Cecil spoke of the emancipation of Iraq, even as he had spoken the day before of bringing law and order to Manchuria. And, I wonder, if he did not reach over and touch the toe of his next seat neighbor!

And the delegates all congratulated Iraq—not

present—on her having "attained to full sovereignty and independence!" This is a kind of doxology often used by the Council! And thus for the first time in history, a mandated territory passed into independence! A most artful group of log-rolling politicians. Tammany may come and learn. Here the spoils are nations and unborn generations!

The Secretary-General. And here I must pay my respects to Eric Drummond, Secretary-General of the League, who has been "going on forever." He has been a study ever since I came to Geneva. I now have seen him playing the game in public. It is my judgment that he is one of the most powerful factors in the League, and if I were Prime Minister I should soon present his name, for a seat in the House of Lords, for most distinguished service for the Empire. I had been assured that he was only a rubber-stamp. My first query arose from the fact that he held such an important post in an international organization, *permanently.* Such a position is a control position, whether in a school board, town council. How the nations could have adopted such an organization I can not understand. Since that, I have had the opportunity of seeing Mr. Drummond in operation. I have noted him as he has whispered to the chairman, whom he sits next to, and then to Robert Cecil on his other side. I have watched him as representatives came to him. He is not General *Secretary,* but Secretary *General.* I have admired the extreme skill with which he manipulates the course of business. Nothing escapes his eye. I should name him as the ablest man on the Council. He is not a secretary—not much—but the boss. He is Scotch, and manages the League, even as skilfully as the Irish manage New York City. He is a great asset to the British Empire. There is talk of his quitting his job. Don't believe it—he's too valuable where he is to the Empire. He will be "pressed" to hold on. Now, you have my opinion as to where the control-power in the League is to be found. With him as pilot, and Mr. Henderson on the bridge, and Robert Cecil in the delegation (the most powerful individual in the coming Conference), the British ought to determine pretty much what will be the outcome.

China and Japan.—I have thus far heard two public debates—with Mr. Sato representing Japan, and Mr. Yen representing China. The Council did not seem to be so much concerned over the emancipation of China as over Iraq.

Mr. Yen came fresh from Washington. If you shut your eyes, you could imagine it was an American speaking, good, frank, blunt language. Mr. Sato spoke slowly, read much and spoke in French. That was good diplomacy, as the chairman is French and the majority of the representatives best know French. Mr. Yen said that Japan had invaded China three times. This time, it was without provocation, that Japan had defeated every hope of withdrawing and was creating chaos in China. He had come to the Council with the expectation of having adequate treatment. Mr. Sato replied that Japan was engaged in defending her interests, and remarked that all the powers had stationed warships in Chinese waters, that her occupation of Manchuria was only provisional.

Of course my sympathies flowed toward China in this strife. Japan has plenty of precedents for doing what she has done, and her representative could have reached over and touched several honorable members of the Council who at this minute were engaged in similar proceedings to defend or extend their national interests in some part of the world. But what had been done by Japan was it seemed to me indefensible from any ethical point of view. I do not go beyond that consideration. And China had just come into the Council, sat as it were on the edge, while Japan was one of the Big Five, and had built up an acquaintance for years. I feel convinced that she did not receive at any point, since last September, any discouragement from Britain or France for her invasion of Manchuria. It all seems a great pity and tragedy, and in it all the greedy West seems to be again the gainer, temporarily.

And the Council? Many good sides. A piece of machinery capable of doing a great amount of good—and evil. It is an irresponsible body. Its influence is moral, or may be extremely immoral. It may (and does) clothe gross injustice with a sanction that deceives the world. It has been in the two scenes I witnessed—the emancipation of Iraq and the invasion of China—an instrument in support of stark imperialism.

SYDNEY STRONG.

Postscript.

Shanghai was bombarded while the debate was in progress.

On Independence Day of Iraq a "huge British oil deal was consummated in London, having French, German, Italian and British (55 per cent) interests, to furnish oil to Europe in competition with American and Russian oil!" *Daily Mail.* He that runs may read.

The Japanese representative, on the day of the China-Japan debate, read two long reports of investigations he had made (1) of "The protection of minorities in Upper Silesia" and (2) "The protection of minorities in Poland." I thought his face assumed a curious smile! I rather expected the Chinese representative to rise and call for a commission to investigate "The protection of majorities in Asia!" China and Japan pitted against one another—a divided East—enough to make angels weep—and in a circle of white men! Will the East ever learn?

The Conference sermon was preached by William Temple, Bishop of York. A large crowd. Arthur Henderson read the first lesson, Isaiah 55:6-13. This was a pleasant innovation. The sermon? What could be expected from one who stands near to the top of the Anglican Church? He dared to say one thing, namely, that the war guilt of 1914 must be distributed. Then it was back to pleasant truths about remembering membership in the human family. He said that mutual agreement was more important than specific reduction of arms. What chance had he to hold those people—many of them delegates—up in the presence of the eternal truths of God! No one felt his heart burn within him. . . . The service was held in the Cathedral. Do you recall the first "sermon" Jesus preached. The "first lesson" was taken from the book of Isaiah—same book Mr. Henderson read from—and Jesus had not gone far, when the congregation cast him out! That was the kind of a message needed at this time when the world is blazing in war. This man of God didn't seem to have heard of Shanghai. I am getting more and more out of temper with cathedrals! Christianity caught a deadly cold, when it moved into cathedrals. So, for a 1,000 years. Then, when the people

were able to read the Four Gospels, they began to move out of cathedrals. It is often declared that Christianity captured the Roman Empire, by 325 A. D.—instead, the Roman Empire captured Christianity, and still she is captive.

"Do Your Part to Make World Disarmament a Success"—this is printed on many letters received from America. Good. I pass it on. I am meeting a small group of earnest people who are trying to catch the imagination of the public of Geneva through literature, electric signs, etc., that all should hitch their wagons to the star of *total disarmament now.* S. S.

Why the Conference Failed

There can be only one answer to this question. The Conference failed because it was intended to fail.

India was on the verge of revolt. Churchill said, "Smash them." MacDonald, who was wiser, said "Divide them." MacDonald knew history and followed our time-honored traditions.

Indian rajahs, landlords and most of the industrial capitalists have, on the whole, everything to gain from the present regime. Social revolution threatens their class with extinction. By a few well-chosen concessions, the powerful influence of the Indian bourgeoisie could be deflected in the direction of a compromise. Therefore, in 1929 the Government determined to effect an alliance of mutual aid with this class through a Round Table Conference.

In 1930 they met—the princes, the landowners, the industrialists, the British politicians, and two right-wing organizers of the Indian trades-unions, carefully nominated by the Viceroy. They were called "representatives" and "delegates" of the Indian people. It was a lie, for they were chosen by the Government and represented no one but themselves. They were photographed and made much of in the press. The abominations of Indian feudalism were hidden from the British public, and a Government circular went the round of the press warning the papers against any hint of the truth concerning the princes.

Meanwhile, Mahatma Gandhi and nearly 60,000 Indians had been put in jail, some with trial and some without. An awkward whisper was abroad that India was not properly represented—that the massacre of men and the beating of women required explanation. Some people wanted to know why martial law and ordinances were necessary, and why the leaders of the militant trades unions had been for nearly two years under trial at Meerut as "conspirators."

Such doubts had to be dissipated. Either Gandhi and his followers must be made accomplices in the schemes hatching at St. James' palace, or they must be effectually discredited. They were let out of prison, and for reasons which I have never understood, Gandhi consented to come to the resumed Conference in 1931.

In any ordinary Conference major issues are first decided and minor matters settled afterwards. In this Conference every imaginable detail was discussed first while the Government carefully delayed any pronouncement upon the one vitally important question as to whether or not India was to be free from British domination. Not in vain had they packed the Conference. Gandhi must either agree to the preposterous proposals of their nominees or take the blame for the failure of the Conference. One choice meant a weak, ridiculous and shameful compromise; the other meant that the Government could tell the British public with the help of its willing allies in Fleet Street that "the Indians had disagreed." If the "delegates" were unable to agree, clearly, the Government could do little. Nevertheless, MacDonald looked very noble and heroic, trying to "effect a settlement" and pledging himself to "broaden freedom" in spite of the differences between Mahatma Gandhi and the Government's puppets at the Round Table.

The climax of the farce was the "Minorities Agreement" extensively advertised. The signatories were:

(1) *The Aga Khan.* Best known to the "Society" papers and to turf enthusiasts. On the day of Mrs. Gandhi's arrest this January, her photograph and his appeared on the same page of a well-known London paper; he was playing golf in the south of France. His chief interest in India is a large annual tribute.

(2) *Dr. Ambedkar,* President of the "All-India Depressed Classes Association"—*with a membership of about 1,500.* Dr. Ambedkar has a long record as a Government-nominated member of Government bodies. At the Conference, Dr. Ambedkar opposed Gandhi's claim for Universal Adult Suffrage without distinction by claiming (as their supposed "delegate") separate representation for the "Untouchables." The Mahatma refused to agree to this scheme for stigmatizing the Depressed Classes in the Constitution, and challenged a referendum among the Depressed Classes as to whether he or Dr. Ambedkar rightly represented them. Dr. Ambedkar wishes to give "Untouchability" a legal status. (3), (4) and (5) were representatives of the Europeans, Anglo-Indians and Indian Christians. The first two were true representatives of their small communities, but for the good name of the last community I hope it does *not* endorse its "delegates'" attitude.

Those five men made the preposterous claim that they represented 46 per cent of the population of India. Almost the whole of this 46 per cent was supposed to consist of the Moslems and the "Untouchables." The Moslems, that is to say, those whose share in Civil Disobedience had been as great in proportion to their numbers as any Community in India, and the Untouchables, whose cause has continually been the cause of Gandhi and the Congress. To keep up this illusion, the *agents provokateurs* of the Bombay Government even had to stage a supposed "Untouchable Demonstration" against Gandhi on his return to India—a thing unspeakably foolish to any one who knew the repute in which he is held among the depressed classes. It was a pity they could not say that the Moslem crowds on whom the police fired at Peshawar were also "demonstrating against Gandhi." But unfortunately, their arrested leader (a Moslem) was the local Congress leader, and known as the Frontier Gandhi.

In a later article I shall explain more exactly the relationship of the Round Table Fraternity to the Government and in particular the origin of that small group of wealthy Moslems that so loudly demands "communal" electorates, safeguards, etc. For the moment the true nature of the "Minorities Agreement" can best be judged from internal evidence. Their points included powers of veto in "Governors" and

"Governors-General," from which one may gather they contemplated continued servitude for India. They included claims by the Europeans and Anglo-Indians (endorsed by the other so-called delegates) for continued favoritism of their communities in the form of public offices to be over-paid at the old rates, special privileges in the law-courts, in state scholarships, etc. *It was a charter of insolent class and race privileges.*

Gandhi defied them. The premier's offer to "arbitrate" he refused. How could any one "arbitrate" between India's rights and these impudent claims? But England saw him as an implacable fanatic, and MacDonald, who had staged the whole affair, as a "peace-maker"! The Conference had done its work.

Before Gandhi's return to India the truce between Congress and the government had already been broken by the latter. An attempt of the government of the United Provinces to collect taxes and enforce rents which were the subject of negotiation at the time had been met by a No-Rent Campaign, endorsed by the Congress. Repressive measures in the U. P. were followed by the infamous "Star Chamber" ordinance in Bengal and Government terrorism in the North West Frontier Province. It was the Viceroy's refusal even to *discuss* these measures with Mahatma Gandhi that led to the resumption of civil disobedience throughout India. The arrest of Gandhi and other leaders in an attempt to forestall this move on the part of the masses only precipitated the struggle more rapidly.

Out of it MacDonald's puppets have pieced together a constitutional framework which will make its debut (if it ever does) in an India of Ordinances and Martial Law, of jailed leaders and bleeding followers. The Round Table Constitution will be an old play under a new title. A "wider" property franchise, from which the masses will still be excluded; British governors with vetoes; British control of the army and foreign policy; "safeguarding" of all the ghastly tribute paid by starving India to British capitalists, including the so-called "National Debt" and the pensions of retired satraps—85 per cent of the Central Budget "reserved" for British pockets; and in return the rajah, the landlord and the Indian capitalist promised "security" against social revolt.

There is only one factor MacDonald and his friends have ignored. It is the people of India. The coming year will show whether the ignoble arts of Clive can still hold India against the peasant and the worker. But are we in England to be idle spectators of the struggle?

REGINALD REYNOLDS.

Miner Tragedy!

The sun was pouring brilliant like a ball
Of molten steel, and milky clouds were straying
Around the circled sky's indelible wall.
But what was that to miners who were paying
Their precious lives to labor underground?
And what were nature's paintings worth to souls
Who had to peer in darkness, dig, and pound
Through mountain lungs as human worms or moles!

I shuddered! Crack!—a sharp resounding boom!
The mountain heaved and bulged and heavy layers
Folded and rained on helpless men in doom!
I lived their anguish, moans, and rending prayers!—
And fell with grief. When I arose I heard
An aching song of one lamenting bird.

MELVILLE KRESS.

I Help to Mount a Butterfly

"See what I have," he called with pride;
And there before my eyes
Exhibited a jar that held
The prince of butterflies!

Such transient loveliness it was,
So delicate of bloom
It tore my heart to see it caged
Within a glassy room.

Wings that had soared were quiet now
Or tremulously stirred.
"Please let it go!" I cried . . . in vain.
He smiled at what he heard.

"What is it good for then?" he asked.
"One flash of wings . . . it dies.
"I'm saving it. I have a friend
"Collecting butterflies."

The sky was blue as only June
Can fashion. All the grass
Was vivid green. And roses bloomed
A sigh beyond the glass.

"If you are giving it away,"
I countered, sudden-wise,
"Give it to me! I have a Friend
"Who does with butterflies
"Such things as you could scarce believe.
"O! give it to me, please."
The jar was mine . . . and as he left
I fell upon my knees

And offered up his own to one
Who pins His butterflies
To velvet moss or dewy rose,
And mounts them on the skies!

And then we smiled, my Friend and I.
With his protection
Had I not saved a butterfly
For God's collection?

BERTHA WILLIAMS

Song of a Derelict

On the Home Stretch

I sailed down the sea in a path of gold—
My course was marked by foam.
I fixed my gaze on the world's white rim—
At last I was going home.
The moon hung full above my track—
Two stars were in the sky:
They held me with a questioning glance
Till I signalled them back a reply.
Each yawning seam and riven beam
Drew fast with a quivering strain.

I nerved my keel to a swerveless line and forced her through the main.
Straight down the golden way we bore, no longer a drifting wreck.
A thousand spirits of seamen bold came crowding to my deck.
Their faces pale were toward my prow: They saw neither moon nor star
But each and all gazed hard with me in search of an unseen bar.

Oh gaily we skim to the world's white rim,
On outstretched wings we fly—
And blithely we say of that perilous bay
"It is not death to die."
The sky is dark—the stars grow dim—
Each spirit bold has flown.
Alone—I dip 'neath the world's white rim.
It is my last stretch home.

FLORA WHITE

The Study Table

The Church in the Social Order

Before me are the writings* of two modern ministers, leaders in their respective faiths. Preachers both of them, they have carried—to a greater or lesser extent—their ideals from the cloister and pulpit to the hardier arena of the market place and workaday world. They may not therefore be dismissed by the cynically critical as mere theoreticians and visionaries, completely out of touch with the stubborn and grim facts of our industrial society.

Aside from the similarities mentioned, it should be noted that both of them are members of the American Civil Liberties Union, and that both these books were chosen one after the other as the choice of the Religious Book Club. After these likenesses are mentioned, the crossroads are reached, and in following them on their journey through the pages of their books —to say nothing of carrying out their preachments— I find myself being escorted along two radically different religious paths; as radically different as the liberal and radical are from each other.

Dr. Silver, treating of the relationship the church should maintain toward the state with regard to our economic order and system, says, "The church cannot, of course, align itself with a propaganda for one specific economic system as against another. . . . The church is not concerned with systems but with the safeguarding of principles which each age must be challenged to work into such a system as will best meet its economic needs." (Page 60.)

Dr. Ward, contrariwise, probing to the roots of our social system, sees clearly the perils of the situation which ". . . limits the utterances of the pulpit of the church bodies to general principles, and leaves details to the laymen . . . when they attempt to decide what forms of property are not justified by the ethics of the gospel, then the war is on . . . if there is no actual grappling with existing institutions . . . its capacity for transforming civilization is impaired." (Pages 23, 25.)

Silver himself is witness to the wisdom of Ward's insistence on the need to deal in particulars and concretions, and this is on the question of Peace. As Silver urges the church to endorse the World Court, he is illustrating the truth of Ward's dictum that the church is refusing to come to grips with the Frankenstein monster capitalism, though it is by now, after the sad and disillusioning experience of the World War, willing to grapple with the other Frankenstein war. Ward illuminatingly points out that "the demands of the churches for a warless world . . . have moved away from vague, pious sentimentality toward practical concreteness. . . . Nor is it likely that a pragmatic ethic alone will carry us over these intrenchments of passion and prejudice." (Page 91.)

I have already called attention to Ward's superior insight into the entanglement and alliance of the church with the state, in the matter of our economic and industrial order. He is as masterly and courageous with regard to the whole menace of war and militarism. His star shines so much brighter as it impinges on the darker background of Silver's optimism and romanticism. "Education is, in the last analysis, mankind's surest irenicon. . . . Until the nations of the world are assured of a competent international agency which will protect them against unjustified aggression, they will not, they cannot, they *should* not disarm. The church will be in a position to create a real temperament for peace, a peaceful frame of mind, a will to peace. Peace is not altogether a question of economics. Nations do not make war or establish peace solely for economic reasons." (Page 91.) So Silver! Ward minces no words in coming out directly and telling how "our new militaristic nationalism is after all only an aspect of a larger fact—our economic imperialism. . . . The demand for preparedness reduces finally to the simple idea that we are now a very wealthy people living in a very wicked world which will take our possessions away from us unless we can defend them. . . . Underneath is the unseen force of our new billions of paper wealth, with its legal claims to income concentrated in a fraction of the people but scattered around the earth." Ward, in giving due weight to the economic interpretation of history, "has the jump" on Silver. Ward is the realist as he recognizes the roots of war in our economic order. Silver is the optimist and impractical visionary as he puts his trust in a state of mind that the church is to inculcate. It remains for Ward to point out the menace in the National Defense Act and its activities of military training in high schools and colleges, R. O. T. C. and Boy Scout organizations.

An appreciation of Soviet Russia is as surely the measure of a man these days as any other one thing. Silver carefully and conveniently keeps as far away from this subject as possible, though he does, at a few sudden moments, dash in stealthily and deal the Soviets a quick blow. The tone of his references to the "red gospel of Russia," the "red fraternity," "the Bolshevik Russia today," which he says, "is the proletariat class which is playing the old game of usurpation," show him to be far from friendly to that regime. Surely he shows a lack of those very qualities of faith and loyalty to the ideal which he claims is the special province of the religionist, when he is unable to discern on the horizon the classless society of Socialism, that will usher in the universal brotherhood of man in religion. Ward establishes his right to the company of the geniuses and prophets of our age by his vision and understanding with regard to Soviet Russia. Ward has these prophetic words to utter on Russia: "It is a religion of action. . . . It is in Socialism that we find the real religion of Science. . . . And it is among the communists, the militant wing of the Socialists that we find the full development of the religious elements in that movement. . . . In Russia with a clean field before it, Communism has developed into a new state religion. . . . It stands as one of the greatest bits of human engineering ever achieved. . . . Behind it is one of the most powerful religions ever developed by man. . . . The Messianic hope has thus become communized. . . . What is clear is that Communism stripped of its dogmatic glorification and use of force—in common with Socialism—gives us the religion of humanity."

So, to the prospective reader of the books under

*"Which Way Religion?" by Rev. Harry F. Ward. New York. The Macmillan Company. $2.00.

"Religion in a Changing World," by Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver. Richard Smith, Inc. New York. $2.00.

review, I can say only this. If you want to read for the unadulterated joy of reading, if you want to be charmed and soothed by flowing, fluid oratory as were the congregants of the silver-tongued Rabbi, then you may turn eagerly to the popular volume by Rabbi Silver. You may rest assured he will charm and enchant you with his vivid verbal imagery—"the modern scientist is like a child who suddenly finds himself in a new and marvelous toy-shop." He will entertain you with some choice legends that unavoidably bob up in the course of a stirring sermon. He will treat of the whole gamut of human society and institutions that are listed in the table of contents; of science, social justice, social service, liberalism and education. Attractive, isn't it? And so it is! But all that glitters and glistens is not "silver." I found nothing but the same dull balderdash that is to be had at all our institutions of liberalism and pragmatism, that never plumb the depths of our tragic and cruel civilization—with its economics realities, its privileged and dominant class and its rule of propertied interests. Of course a book like this would be a best-seller, and therein is its consolation. A year from today, will it be remembered? It is my guess that its popularity is an ephemeral one, fated to disappear quickly as it deserves.

And of the other book what can I say? But it is hardly fair to call it a book, with that term being bandied about so loosely and indiscriminately. Not given to enthusiasm easily, nevertheless I find myself turning these pages in a humbled and worshipful mood. For there speaks through these pages, as in the writings of a Tolstoy and a Gandhi, the voice of a prophet. No mincing of words here, no flinching at taking a resolute and dangerous stand. Which Way Religion? The question narrows down "to the role that it will play when the next stage of economic organization is being ushered in. . . ." And that stage is amidst us now. "It is the weakness also of the intellectual movement in Protestantism that it is apart from the life and needs of the common people." No pious platitudes here, but in its place, hard unpalatable truths. No avalanche of rhetoric and oratory, though his feelings and sentiments are at such a white heat that you are reminded of Theodore Dreiser, with his quality of infinite compassion for human suffering tied toegther with the same overt ability to do something about it. And don't think Ward is hard to read! His social passion and profound insight has lent a fluidity and ease to his writing that makes it most readable.

As Ward brings to a spearhead the question of the role of the church in our industrial society, he actually may be said to be vested in the mantle of the prophet—and not of the school of the prophets either! Ward sees clearly and unmistakably that the fate of the church hinges on its relationship to our economic order of capitalism, and its intricacies of militarism and imperialism. The labor movement is at present inert, if not reactionary, in the United States, and the part the church will play in the battle between capital and labor will be decisive. Ward sees the church in the embarrassing position of having to make a definite choice, and not in abstractions or generalizations. If it throws in its lot with our iniquitous capitalistic system, then organized religion in America will go down with the ship when it sinks. Ward has thrown down the gage to the church, whether it shall survive or perish.

NATHAN ESSELL.

Note

Dr. J. T. Sunderland's widely read book on India, entitled "India in Bondage," has just been forbidden publication in England. The great English publishers, Allen, Unwin & Company, London, had received the revised manuscript and were setting type when the order came stopping the work. The book, published in America and France, was barred in India on its first appearance. The truth of Dr. Sunderland's testimony about British rule in India is abundantly attested by this record of events.

Correspondence

Citizen No. 1 or Jesus as He Was

Editor of UNITY:

The cooperation of the Jew is essential to a real understanding of Jesus by a Christian. For many years I have hoped that the Jew and the Christian would come to discuss Jesus together. Jesus for many, many centuries has been shrouded in unreality because of a lack of such cooperation. Within the last month two articles written by Jews on the subject of Jesus have appeared in UNITY. On January 11 appeared an article by Rabbi Louis L. Mann, entitled: "What Christmas Means to a Jew," and on January 18 was published an article by Rabbi Louis I. Newman, entitled: "If I Were a Christian."

In the article by Rabbi Mann, the sentence which has made the most powerful effect on me, and which seems to go to the root of the problem, is the following:

> "The time has come, I firmly believe, when the crucifixion story must be retold so as not to make the Jew the villain in the drama of salvation. That the Jews did not kill Jesus every scholar knows."

Personally, I should like to hear a little more along that line from Rabbi Mann. Can he retell the crucifixion story? If Rabbi Mann believes that the Jews did not kill Jesus, he has undoubtedly very good material to substantiate his position, and if his position is true, then Jesus was killed by the Romans, and if that were the case it would be necessary to determine exactly under what Roman law the Romans were proceeding. The laws of the Romans at that time are well known.

Rabbi Mann would probably admit that, if the Romans killed Jesus, certain Jews in Jerusalem were cooperating with the Romans to bring about the death. Each proposition here must be looked into with the most extreme caution. We must get our facts right, otherwise we shall never be able to "retell" the story of the crucifixion. We must not try to retell this story either in favor of the Christians or in favor of the Jews. We have a new object before us, to get a picture of Jesus as he was.

My general conception of Jesus is that he was in some way or other a founder of civic rights, in a world where civic rights practically did not exist. Once in England, I heard Jesus referred to as "Citizen No 1." That seems to be about right.

Rabbi Newman, in his article speaks as follows:

> "If I were a Christian, I would seek to place Jesus of Nazareth in his rightful place in the line of religious leaders. I would consider him as a Rabbi in Israel, a patriotic young Jewish champion, who lived, suffered and died as a Jew. I would apply to the story of his life the strictest canons of literary and historical criticism."

The thought comes to me that if we apply these canons, we must reserve judgment, at least until we finish our investigation, both as to whether Jesus was a "rabbi" and also as to whether he was a "religious leader."

Let us decide if possible certain leading facts. Christians, generally speaking, believe that Jesus was put to death by the Jews. The Christian theory is that the crucifixion grew out of some little dispute among the Jews in which the Romans took no interest.

Responsibility for the death of Jesus has never been laid at the door of the Roman state, and perhaps the reason for this may be that, as the Roman state ultimately accepted Christianity as its official cult, it shoved responsibility for the crucifixion upon the shoulders of the Jews. There is or was, then, on the part of the Roman state, a possible motive for twisting the story.

As I look at the question, I am always confronted by the following contradiction: If the death of Jesus resulted from a petty dispute among Jews in which the Romans took no interest, why was it that, beginning with the deaths of Peter and Paul in Rome, and even earlier, it was the Roman state that handed out death to the Christians up to the Edict of Milan in the year 312? The Jews had nothing to do with all that butchery.

No. We cannot accept, without question, the Christian theory. We must look deeper into this matter. There is no use or profit in professing a religion that is founded on a historical falsehood.

If Jesus was a patriotic Jew, how did his patriotism come in conflict with established power? That is precisely the point that is shrouded in obscurity.

But we are only at the very beginning of our inquiry. Who were these Jews who were plotting the destruction of Jesus, and what was their relation to the Roman state? What law did Jesus violate which made it possible for Pilate to decree his execution? The boast of the Romans was that they did everything according to law. Here we must have the help of our Jewish friends. We want them to tell us who these Pharisees were, who seemed to be plotting the undoing of Jesus. As I said before, we must look at this question with a perfectly cold-blooded objectivity.

My own investigations made in the Holy Land and elsewhere have led me to the following conclusion. There was among the Jews, as among all the other nations subject to the Roman power, a party which was in favor of the Romans. Intense rivalry existed between this party and the rest of the Jewish people. Jesus came in conflict with this party. The high-priest and "the rulers" belonged to this party. These people held their appointments from Rome, not from the Jewish people. The Pharisees, while performing all the details of Jewish religious custom, seemed to have had a doctrine which justified the Roman domination. I do not believe we shall ever understand the Jesus problem, or ever be able to retell the crucifixion story, unless we can unearth and clearly reconstruct the political situation existing in Jerusalem at that time.

It is the cooperation of the Jew with the Christian which can alone re-present Jesus to the modern world. What the Jew has, and what he has had for over 3,000 years, is a spiritual and moral truth which every Christian, every Hindu, every follower of any other religion needs today to take a firm hold of. In every so called "religion" of the present day there is a great deal of nonsense, a great deal of superstition, fanaticism and ignorance.

We cannot draw conclusions until we know the facts. We cannot know the facts until we get rid of the nonsense.

EDWARD HOLTON JAMES

Geneva, Switzerland

War Debts, America, France and the Versailles Treaty

Editor of UNITY:

In connection with the troublesome problem of the debts owed by allied European countries to the United States, the remark is frequently heard: "The money was lent when urgently needed and, if not paid, our people will have to pay in increased taxes. In other words our people will bear the burden of another nation's liabilities. Why should the United States cancel the debts?"

At first thought that question seems fair enough. It seems perfectly clear that it is unfair and unjust to tax our population, who were not in the slightest degree responsible for bringing on that monstrous exhibition of crime and insanity, to pay its bills. Why indeed should we?

But is there indeed no reason why a certain share of the war debts should not be assumed by us? Is there no reason why the United States should not bear part of the burden now pressing so heavily upon the nations of Europe?

This is a time for facing facts and facing them squarely. It is a time for searching investigation, for understanding as thoroughly as possible all details connected with the subject. Many contend that the war was not ours in any sense. That was true until the time when we entered into it. The reasons why the United States entered the war do not necessarily come into this argument. The widespread deception of our people by propaganda released with deliberate intention to inflame and prejudice the population and which succeeded in misleading all classes, educated as well as the average citizen, intelligent as well as thoughtless—that is beside the point though it should be a lesson to everyone to be wary in future and to know that every reaon put forth by any government for engaging in warfare will be based on lies—lies—and nothing but lies. "If the truth were told from the outset, there would be no reason and no will for war."

But having entered into it we can no longer plead that it was not to some extent our war. Had the United States never sent any soldiers or marines to the battlefront we would be in a much better position to assert, with justice, that the World War was not our war and hence that the war debts owed us should be paid. But having deliberately taken part in it, does it not become our duty to share in its consequences however disagreeable and even burdensome those consequences may become? If, then, one major outcome is loss of money, must we not be prepared to shoulder our share of such loss without too much fuss and whining? We brought the trouble on ourselves when we entered the war—a thing which this nation should never have done. Our entrance served to prolong the war and thus to increase immensely the expense and to prevent its closing without definite victory for either side. This latter condition would have been vastly preferable, as we see it now, to what actually eventuated, since in that case the abominable Versailles Treaty could not have been forced upon the defeated nations and the apparently inextricable muddle which is putting the whole world out of gear today would never have impeded our course.

Since the signing of that treaty the French government has pursued a policy so unreasonable, so narrow, so determinedly and consistently imbued with thought of self-interest, that it is unquestionably partly responsible for the present plight of the world.

The German nation has been deprived of its army and navy, practically, yet the French government has continued to whimper and plead fear of possible invasion instead of behaving like grown men who have the situation well in hand. Is the United States going to let France continue to block moves toward peace and economic reconstruction by dominating the deliberations of the Geneva conference and thus prevent the moves which would help the nations to step out of the bog they are wallowing in? Can not our country, by acknowledging its mistake in entering the war and shouldering its share of the loss in the tangled debt problem, assume that moral leadership which will enable it to exercise an influence at Geneva that will be a power for disarmament and peace?

LYDIA G. WENTWORTH

Brookline, Mass.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 2)

added, "with such a movement of our citizens generally I would have it done."

Another man said that he had wanted for a long time to fix over his library, but he had put it off, and would not now have it done, except upon an urge like this, and then he *would* have it done.

I presented it to the president of one of our banks, and he said: "I think you have an idea." I presented it to one of our large contractors, and he enthused about it. Said the thing seemed to him to be so far-reaching—that it would help all kinds of business, including the railroads."

With this encouragement, Mr. Todd called together a few of his friends to lay the plan before them and at the suggestion of the Mayor of Rochester, the Civic Committee on Unemployment, which had been in existence for some time and which was supported by the City, County and the Community Chest, were asked to undertake the campaign.

In order to test it out, a small group made a canvass of a few hundred citizens before announcing the plan generally. This preliminary canvass resulted in obtaining 486 sponsors, who pledged to spend a total of $701,000.

With this result it was concluded to make a thorough canvass of the

city, street by street, house by house, and so the services of that veteran campaigner, Harry P. Wareheim, who successfully managed Red Cross, Y. M. C. A., War Chest drives during the World War, and since that time has been the manager of the Rochester Community Chest, were arranged for. Mr. Wareheim got together a general chairman, fourteen division chairmen, twenty-four ward chairmen, 100 block captains, 924 block workers, in Rochester and another group representing the villages and country districts in Monroe County, a total of about 1,300 individuals.

During the ten days of the campaign, from December 4 to December 14, a thorough canvass of the city of Rochester and of the nineteen towns in Monroe County was made. All classes and every section responded. In Rochester the plan was sponsored by the Catholic bishop; the head of the Jewish church; the head of the Federation of Churches; the Chamber of Commerce, the judiciary, legislators, county supervisors, city councilmen, educators, bankers, business men and citizens generally.

Pledges were made by a little old lady who could do nothing more than have a sofa reupholstered and from there all the way up to the large industrial plant that could spend up to $100,000.

The workers were told not to urge anyone to make a foolish expenditure but simply ask them to do now the things that they could find to do, or make any purchases that might otherwise be deferred.

And now comes the main feature of the Rochester Plan, the one that sews it up, makes it something real rather than a "good thought." Every individual pledging, signed the pledge, which has been quoted before, and, when he signed the pledge, there was left with him a fulfilment report blank to be sent to the Civic Committee on Unemployment at the end of the three month period so that the fact that his pledge had been carried out could be duly recorded. This report read as follows:

"The expenditure which I pledged in the amount of $..... has been completed. The total expenditure was $..... of which $..... was the cost of improvements to real estate. $..... was for equipment, furnishings and personal effects.

Signed .....
Address ....."

At the inception of the campaign the workers hoped that they might have pledged during the ten days as much as $2,000,000. The response was like the response received in seventeen and eighteen when the Liberty Loan campaigns were being conducted. Very early in the campaign it was foreseen that the two million mark was too low and it was hoped that it might be doubled. When the campaign closed, on schedule, on December 14, there was great enthusiasm when it was found that the workers had obtained 10,771 pledges for $6,026,351.96, the individual pledges running from very small ones up to ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty and even over one hundred thousand dollars. The average pledge made was $557. Bringing this down still further it meant that $15 was pledged to represent every individual in Rochester and in Monroe County.

Immediately there was a definite reaction to the campaign. While the majority of the pledges were to be carried out within three months, most of the smaller pledgors started their work immediately. The day that the campaign closed, a paper hanger, who said he hadn't had a call for months, received four telephone calls to come and estimate on jobs. And so it went. Purchases were made, money was immediately put into circulation, with a result that the New York State Department of Labor in making their report for the month of December, which they did on January 9, stated that of all the cities in the State of New York, Rochester alone showed an increase in employment. We have no way to account for that increase in employment except that it came as a result of this six millions of dollars in pledges that were made by our citizens.

Naturally the campaign in Rochester attracted wide attention and individuals representing many communities have given the plan careful study. It is being put on in many other places. It has been endorsed by many organizations and having seen the plan worked out, the people in Rochester say: "Here is a formula that we recommend to you."

During the campaign the Chamber of Commerce of the United States sent an investigator to Rochester to learn about the plan. Having gone into it thoroughly, he made this statement:

"Out of several hundred unemployment relief plans that I have examined for the United States Chamber of Commerce during the past two years, your plan was the only one that I recommended for adoption in its entirety."

His investigation resulted in a descriptive circular on the plan being sent out by the United States Chamber of Commerce to over fifteen hundred member Chambers throughout the country. In his letter of transmittal, Mr. F. Stuart Fitzpatrick, Manager of the Civic Development Department of the United States Chamber, says:

"In addition to the now generally accepted community organization programs for unemployment relief, a recent experience in Rochester, New York, indicates that an intensive effort, based on a simple and direct procedure, which gives the individual a concrete and recognized means of expressing his willingness to cooperate, will get results and accomplish much practical good."

And now you are saying to yourself: "It was a fine campaign, well thought out, well handled, but what has it actually accomplished?" Final reports on the pledges are not due until April but many have come in and so far (February 15) they exceed the amounts pledged by 18%.

The slogan used during the campaign was—"The independent effort of an individual may be but a feeble gesture—but when he joins in mass formation with his neighbors the same effort becomes an irresistible and mighty force."

The force of the concerted action of the citizens of Rochester and Monroe County has been felt since the campaign and will be reflected for some time to come in increased employment activity. Over $6,000,000 is being expended. Employment is being given.

Many columns have been printed in papers and magazines throughout the country describing the plan. Rochester doesn't feel that it has any patent on the plan. It is a plan that any community can put on. They can pretty nearly gauge their results by estimating the amount of pledges as an average of $15 per capita for the population of the area to be solicited. The sponsors of the Rochester campaign have urged other communities very strongly to make no changes in the plan as it was handled in Rochester, if they decide to adopt it. If Rochester were to do it over again they would follow the plan through in exactly the same way, that is, using the pledge which says "I Will" and the fulfilment report which says "I Have" and then making a general canvass of all individuals, corporations, etc.

In Rochester it was handled as a real civic movement without any commercialism whatsoever. Everyone was given a free hand in carrying out his pledge, employing whomsoever he desired to do the work and making his purchases from merchants of his own choice.

Either Mr. Libanus M. Todd, the Rochester Civic Committee on Unemployment, whose secretary is S. Park Harman, or the Rochester Chamber of Commerce will gladly answer any specific inquiries or furnish more detailed information to individuals or organizations desiring to adopt the plan.

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Back Up the Poetry Editors of UNITY, LUCIA TRENT and RALPH CHEYNEY
by buying their new joint book:
DREAMERS' HOUSE
SAID OF THIS BOOK:
"A bright, brave book!"—E. Mirick.
"A unique book by two of America's most lovable poets."—A. M. Stephens.
SAID OF THEIR PREVIOUS BOOKS:
"Lucia Trent need not write another line to make certain her shining immortality." The English Journal. "Final evidence of poetic genius," John Haynes Holmes.
"What I call poetry," Robert Frost. "There is the burning heart of life in your verses." Wm. Ellery Leonard.
Foreword by Glenn Ward Dresbach. Publisher: Robert Packard & Co., Chicago.
$1.60 postpaid
Order, autographed, from its authors at
259 SOUTH 44th ST., PHILADELPHIA, PA.